

Honorable Carl Vinson  
Chairman  
Committee on Armed Services  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Vinson:

In reading the printed hearings on Military Posture before the House Committee on Armed Services in January and February of this year, I believe a statement on page 269 is worthy of comment. Mr. Stratton refers to a briefing by General Carter on 12 September 1962. Mr. Stratton points out that General Carter stressed the fact that the weapons that were in Cuba were defensive in nature and states that General Carter "also went on to point out that there was no reason why the Soviets should put in any long-range offensive missiles in Cuba because they had the capacity to fire from the homeland and therefore did not need to go into Cuba." I might add that there was no review by this Agency of these hearings for intelligence content prior to their publication.

General Marshall S. Carter, as Acting Director of Central Intelligence in my absence from the country, did accompany the Secretary of State for a joint briefing of the House Armed Services Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee on 12 September 1962. General Carter discussed the Soviet arms being shipped to Cuba and spoke from prepared notes. Mr. John S. Warner, the Agency Legislative Counsel, accompanied General Carter and took notes of the discussion. Neither set of notes include any reference to the substance of the point quoted above. Neither General Carter nor Mr. Warner recall that General Carter spoke to this point. Further, the intelligence community had not at this time made any judgment on this point. It is General Carter's view that if he had discussed the point of why the Soviets were not putting

in long-range offensive missiles he would certainly not have assigned the quoted reason that the Soviets had the capacity to fire from the homeland and did not need to go into Cuba.

It is believed there was press comment about the time of the September hearing in this vein and perhaps there was some misunderstanding on the part of Mr. Stratton, and possibly others. However, I believe it important to note in your records that the Agency did not testify and would not have testified along the lines of the above quotation.

Sincerely,

John A. McCone  
Director

Distribution:

- O & 1 - Addressee
- 1 - DCI (Hand carry by Legislative Counsel)
- 1 - ER
- 1 - OGC/LC Subject

OGC/LC:JSW:rmks (9 May 1963)

UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	
<b>CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY</b> <b>OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP</b>					
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS		DATE		INITIALS
1					
2	DCI				
3	Legislative Counsel - 7 D 07				
4					
5	<i>McCon signature</i>				
6					
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT		FILE		RETURN	
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE	
<b>Remarks:</b>  <p style="text-align: center;">Attached is a proposed letter to Mr. Vinson concerning the Stennis statement. I have reviewed the content of the last two sentences of the second paragraph with both OCI and ONE.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">John S. Warner</p>					
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER					
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.				DATE	
OGC/LC				7 D 07	
				9 May 63	
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	